
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2020

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/20/3252119

95 Jedburgh Road, Plaistow, London, E13 9LF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs R Khatun against the decision of London Borough of Newham Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00159/HH, dated 20 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension on first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal statement submitted on behalf of the appellant, for the most part relates to the incorrect site, incorrect planning history, incorrect planning policies and incorrect development proposal. Accordingly I have given this document very limited weight.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development upon i) the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider area and ii) the living conditions of occupiers at No. 93 Jedburgh Road with particular regard to loss of outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal relates to a mid-terraced house, with a single storey extension that wraps around the original rear outrigger. There is also a large dormer roof extension and a detached outbuilding to the rear of the dwelling, neither of which are shown on the submitted plans.
5. Whilst the predominant material in the area is brick, the rear of many of the properties have been painted, rendered or pebble dashed. The single storey extension and outbuilding to the rear of the appeal dwelling are both finished in a smooth cream render and have flat roofs. The adjoining outrigger at No. 93 Jedburgh Road is finished in pebbledash and the upper section of the outriggers to Nos. 97 & 99 appear to have been rebuilt in new brickwork. Roof materials in the area comprise a mixture of slate tiles, concrete and clay pantiles of varying age and colour, together with flat roofs on the less prominent single storey rear extensions and outbuildings.

6. As the upper floor of the host dwelling, including the outrigger, is finished in brick, the proposed first floor extension, which would be highly visible, should reflect this. Such matters can be controlled by conditions.
7. It is proposed to extend the first floor level of the rear outrigger by 2.2m, in order to create a first floor WC. It was evident upon my visit that properties further south along this side of Jedburgh Road do have slightly longer outriggers as do the properties to the rear of the site on Barking Road. However, I also observed that all adjoining outriggers appear to be of the same length and width. It is considered that the loss of symmetry that would result from extending one side of the outrigger, by the length proposed, would adversely disrupt the form and pattern of development in the area.
8. I therefore conclude that the scale of the extension would conflict with policy SP3 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan 2018 (local Plan), policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to ensure that new development is of high quality design that reflects the character and appearance of the area.

Living conditions

9. There is a single storey flat roof extension to the rear of No. 97 Jedburgh Road. From what I could see, No. 93 does not appear to have any rear extensions although it does have a DIY timber pergola type structure, between the rear of the house and the outbuilding, which is partially covered with blue plastic sheeting immediately to the rear of the dwelling. This would obstruct light to and outlook from the ground floor windows. I also observed on my site visit that new windows have been installed into the rear elevation of many of the outriggers in the area, which improves light and outlook for the occupiers of those properties.
10. No. 97 does not benefit from an additional window in the end elevation of its outrigger and the proposed extension would reduce the outlook from and increase the sense of enclosure to the side and rear windows of this property. Due to the location of the extension to the south west of No.97 there would also be some loss of sunlight. As the first floor extension would be offset from the boundary of No. 97 these impacts would not be significant.
11. The first floor window in the rear elevation of the outrigger at No.93 would not suffer from any significant loss of light due to its position to the south west of the extension. The proposed extension would however, by virtue of its scale and proximity to the first floor rear window at No.93, result in an overbearing and unacceptable loss of outlook, which would be detrimental to the living conditions of occupiers of that property.
12. I therefore conclude that the scale of the extension would conflict with local plan policy SP8, policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan and the Altering and Extending your Home supplementary Planning Document 2018.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR